DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 130 741 JC 760 624

AUTHOR Schiavone, James
TITLE A Comparison of Two Proposals for a Community College Governance Charter.
PUB DATE Aug 76
NOTE 52p.; Ed.D. Practicum, Nova University

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Faculty; Community Colleges; Decision Making; *Governance; *Junior Colleges; Policy Formation; *Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Participation
IDENTIFIERS Borough of Manhattan Community College; *Participatory Governance

ABSTRACT

Two proposed college governance plans for the Borough of Manhattan Community College (BMCC) were compared to determine which plan allowed for the greatest participation of all members of the college community in campus decision-making. A questionnaire submitted to a sample of BMCC faculty provided data for comparison. Results indicated that faculty members were not aware of the history of the development of governance procedures at the college. Few faculty had been directly involved in the development of either plan. Although the response was low regarding faculty opinions on which plan was considered to be more feasible, democratic, and flexible, a plan previously rejected by the college administration was preferred. It was felt that this plan permitted greater opportunity to achieve maximum potentials on the job, to be self-directing, and to establish individual standards for productivity and quality. However, the alternate plan was felt to provide greater opportunity for involvement in decision-making at the college. Portions of both plans are included in the report. (Author/JDS)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED130741

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

A COMPARISON OF TWO PROPOSALS FOR A COMMUNITY COLLEGE GOVERNANCE CHARTER

by

James Schiavone

Borough of Manhattan Community College

A PRACTICUM PRESENTED TO
NOVA UNIVERSITY IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
OF DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

NOVA UNIVERSITY

August, 1976

JC 760 624

ABSTRACT

This study was undertaken to compare two college governance plans relative to how throughly each one provided for the participation of all concerned within the college community. The Borough of Manhattan Community College was mandated by the Board of Higher Education to develop a participatory governance charter that would involve faculty, students and administration. The degree to which this mandate was fulfilled through the governance proposals formed the purpose of the study. A review of the literature supports the basic thesis that the higher level needs of individuals are met through participatory governance, and that moreover, such a system permits the institution to carry out its mission in a productive manner.

A side by side comparison was made of three corresponding sections of each plan. Additionally, a questionnaire was prepared to determine the opinions of faculty members regarding the degree of individual participation guaranteed by each plan.

The comparison and the questionnaire results clearly indicated the superiority of one plan over the other in relation to participatory governance. The results also indicated those positive aspects of both plans.

Recommendations stemming from the investigation include the institution of positive changes to bring about participatory governance at the College, pending ratification of a permanent

governance charter. The suggested vehicle for bringing about such change is in the procedures utilized by the Faculty Council. Once a plan is ratified, amendments to it can be made to further accommodate greater participatory governance procedures.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION		PAGE
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE	5
III.	PROCEDURES	12
IV.	RESULTS	14
V.	DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	35
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	42
	APPENDICES	43
	A. Letter of Transmittal	44
	B. Questionnaire	45
	FIGURES	
	Figure 1 Summary of questionnaire results	16
	Figure 2 Comparison of plans with regard to departmental personnel and budget committees	25
	Figure 3 Comparison of plans with regard to the personnel review committee	34

INTRODUCTION

The Board of Higher Education of the City of New York, is the policy making body of the City University. Recognizing the value of participatory governance, and faced with student and faculty pressure groups of the 1960's, the Board mandated on May 5, 1969, that every college in the City University review and revise its governance procedures to allow for participation of all members of the college community in decision making in their campus. To date the majority of the colleges in CUNY have done so. The Borough of Manhattan Community College has been trying since May of 1970, to develop a governance plan. Two such proposals for a governance charter were prepared, one in April, 1973, and another in April, 1976. Neither of these proposals has been ratified. The 1973 proposal was approved by the faculty and the students but was rejected by the administration. All must be in agreement for ratification.

This study is concerned with comparing both plans to determine which one more closely corresponds to a participatory system of governance. A review of the literature, which follows, indicates that the participatory system is more productive in terms of individual and organizational goals and objectives. The study concerns itself further with the implications of participatory governance at Borough of Manhattan Community College.

In this study, three sections of both proposals were compared to determine the extent to which they meet the Board's mandate to allow for the participation of all members of the college community in decision making. Any governance plan that enables the college community to fulfill this mandate has significance to every member of the community. Therefore a comparison was made with respect to how closely each proposal permits the " participation of all members of the college community in decision making." The proposals are extensive covering all aspects of governance within the college. For the purposes of this limited study, only specific aspects of the proposals were selected. Those sections selected for comparison were:

1. The College Personnel and Budget Committee.
2. The Department Personnel and Budget Committee.
3. The Personnel Review Committee.

These committees make decisions on appointments, re-appointments, tenure and non-reappointments of the professional staff. Their composition and function is of paramount importance to every faculty member who is not tenured, and to those tenured members seeking promotion.

A major problem at the College has been to develop a plan or governance charter that allows for more democratic and efficient sharing of leadership and responsibility among more members of the staff to better cope with the problems of a dynamic educational institution. Getting any plan ratified has been

a problem since the Board mandate requires approval by faculty, students, President, and the Board. The presentation of each plan to the faculty has resulted in an endless series of proposal changes being sent back and forth between various groups. What is needed is a proposal that would represent the best possible compromise of all the divergent and conflicting interests within the College. It appears that no governance charter can give to every person all of the conditions he wants without coming into conflict with what someone else wants. The question that the faculty must ask is whether a governance plan, created by group process is better than no plan at all.

The mandate of the Board of Higher Education is clear. All members of the college community must be allowed to participate in decision making on campus. The type of governance which the Board is suggesting will provide for an environment in which the higher level needs of individuals may be satisfied.

The proposals were compared according to a summarization of Theory Y assumptions as postulated by McGregor (8). These assumptions are explained in greater detail in the following section of the study. The comparison was made in terms of the extent to which Theory Y assumptions were accommodated, allowing for movement toward a System 4 approach to governance (6). This approach is also explained in the following section of the study. In essence, the comparison demonstrated those aspects of each proposal which allowed for full participation of the college community as mandated.

The Theory Y assumptions considered in this study were:

1. The plan permits the individual to achieve a sense of fulfillment as well as to satisfy material requirements.
2. The plan permits the individual to be involved in the definition of what is to be done and how it is to be done.
3. The plan allows the individual to be self directing.
4. The plan permits the individual to assume responsibility for evaluation through reasonable performance targets.
5. The plan permits the individual to do the best job possible and to establish his own standard for productivity and quality.

In order to provide faculty input a questionnaire and letter of transmittal was used. These appear in the Appendix.

BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE

The significance of this study is closely allied to those theories and findings of investigators who have probed the realm of human behavior and how it operates within organizational structures. How this behavior can be predicted and controlled is an important aspect of successful management. Problems arise when an organization is highly task oriented, with little regard for human needs and aspirations. When attention is given to the individuals that make up the organization, allowing them opportunities to participate in the decision making process, more successful management may follow.

Maslow's work on human motivation is based on a hierarchical order of motivational needs (7). He insists that man is never satisfied and is continuously desiring something.

> Man is a wanting animal and rarely reaches a state of complete satisfaction except for a short time. As one desire is satisfied, another pops up to take its place.... Proper respect has never been paid by the constructors of motivation theories to either of these facts: first, that the human being is never satisfied except in a relative or one-step-along-the-path fashion, and second that wants seem to arrange themselves in some sort of hierarchy of prepotency (7:24-5).

Maslow places at the highest level those self-actualizing needs as self-fulfillment, accomplishment, and personal identity. Herzberg (4) goes further on this point and suggests that these higher level needs, which include challenge and opportunity should be the main thrust or focus of an organization.

Management improves when it seeks out the talents and expertise that already exists in the organization, and permits opportunity for the utilization of these talents. This leads to individual success and a sense of achievement which tends to satisfy higher level needs. This motivation-hygiene theory of Herzberg, in which individuals within an organization may attain higher level needs has implications for community college governance procedures.

Douglas McGregor (8), an industrial psychologist, stated that behind every managerial decision or action are assumptions about human nature and human behavior. These assumptions are:

1. The average human being has an inherent dislike of work and will avoid it if he can.
2. Because of this human characteristic of dislike of work, most people must be coerced, controlled, directed, threatened with punishment to get them to put forth adequate effort toward the achievement of organizational objectives.
3. The average human being prefers to be directed, wishes to avoid responsibility, has relatively little ambition, wants security above all (8:33-4).

On this set of assumptions, McGregor postulated his Theory X, a managerial system, or traditional view that requires the individual to adapt to the organization and its needs.

Where Theory X is at work management is in complete control of the situation giving external direction and supervision so that individuals conform to the needs of management and the organization.

At the opposite side of the scale are another set of assumptions which McGregor called Theory Y assumptions or the integration of individual and organizational goals. These assumptions may be summarized and characterized as being dynamic, permitting the possibility of human growth and development. They stress the necessity for selective adaptation rather than for a single absolute form of control. These assumptions call for an organizational response to the needs of individuals. They are corroborated by Argyris (1) and Drucker (2).

Richardson (9:14) explains that Theory Y assumptions view the individual as seeking an opportunity to achieve the highest possible psychological needs from love and recognition up to self-fulfillment and self-actualization.

McGregor (8:50) avers that the concept of integration (the creation of conditions such that the members of the organization can achieve their own goals best by directing their efforts toward the success of the enterprise) and self-control carries the implication that the organization will be more effective in achieving its economic objectives if adjustments are made, in significant ways, to the needs and goals of its

members. McGregor (8:56) concludes that many statements have been made to the effect that we have acquired today the know-how to cope with virtually any technological problems which may arise, and that the major industrial advances of the next half century will occur on the human side of enterprise. Such advances, however, are improbable so long as management continues to organize and direct and control its human resources on the basis of assumptions - tacit or explicit - like those of Theory X. Genuine innovation, in contrast to a refurbishing and patching of present managerial strategies, requires first the acceptance of less limiting assumptions about the nature of the human resources we seek to control, and second the readiness to adapt selectively to the implications contained in those new assumptions. Theory Y is an invitation to innovation.

In a study cited by Herzberg (3:114-15), the findings suggested that opportunities for self-actualization are the essential requirements of both job satisfaction and high performance.

An example of Theory Y in practice is the Scanlon Plan (5). This plan incorporates a formal method providing an opportunity for every member of the organization to contribute his expertise and ingenuity as well as his physical effort to the improvement of organizational effectiveness. According to McGregor (8:113-14), even the repetitive worker at the bottom of the hierarchy is potentially more than a pair of hands. He is a human resource

His know-how and ingenuity, properly utilized, may make a far greater difference to the success of the enterprise than any improvement in his physical effort, although of course his effort is not unimportant. Moreover, he achieves recognition and other important social and ego satisfactions from this utilization of his capacities.

The literature regarding motivation to work, and job satisfaction and high level performance, consistently points to a participational model of management.

Likert (6:14) characterizes four distinct systems of management and indicated degrees of participation in decision making, job satisfaction and productivity within the various systems. The systems range from strict adherence to Theory X assumptions all the way to full utilization of Theory Y assumptions. The systems numbered 1 through 4 are:

System 1. Exploitive authoritative - this essentially emphasizes productivity with no concern for people.

System 2. Benevolent authoritative - this approach demonstrates some concern for people but not enough to fully meet higher level needs.

System 3. Consultative - a transitional model which tends to compromise the opposed assumptions of System 1 and System 4.

System 4. Participative - this system has the potential of achieving the highest level of productivity of the four systems.

In Likert's systems of management, the participational model is stressed as the one that has the greatest effect on meeting higher level needs of employees and in maintaining higher productivity.

Relating these systems to the two year college Richardson (9:108) states:

> It is probable that there is no such thing as a System 1 or a System 4 college. Most two year institutions would probably be grouped somewhere in between with a majority of them falling somewhat below the median; in other words, somewhere between benevolent authoritative and consultative. It is the writers' thesis that Theory X assumptions predominate at present and that it is these assumptions, combined with the administrative systems they produce, that have resulted in the intense role conflict that is evident in our institutions. As a corrollary, we must conclude that there is a need to move toward a System 4 approach with greater reliance upon Theory Y assumptions. Such a movement, because of its emphasis upon participation in goal setting, combined with a reliance upon higher-level needs as motivational forces, could provide the means through which faculty and students become involved in redefining their own roles with full recognition of the interdependency and, hence, accountability that must be characteristic of their new definitions.

This study hinges on the findings of the researchers, theoreticians, and practitioners of management systems cited in this section. These findings combined with philosophical assumptions, indicate that the participatory model of management is the most satisfactory to employees and the most productive in terms of organizational goals and objectives.

The significance of this study to the Borough of Manhattan Community College community is in its comparison of two governance charter plans with respect to how closely each proposal permits the "participation of all members of the college community in decision making," and hence meets the Board's mandate for a participatory governance plan. The study clearly indicates those aspects of each plan which afford the best opportunities for full participation. The study finds one plan to be more participatory in structure than the other.

PROCEDURES

In order to obtain faculty input a questionnaire was utilized. The questionnaire was designed to yield pertinent information relative to faculty reaction regarding the two proposals compared in the study. The questionnaire appears in the Appendix. The questionnaire attempted to determine the following:

1. The degree of faculty participation in the development of both governance plans.
2. Faculty familiarity with either one or both plans.
3. Faculty opinions regarding the degree of utilization of five (5) Theory Y assumptions in each of the governance plans. These five assumptions are stated in the Introduction of the study. Ten questions were presented, each containing two parts relating to each of the governance plans. The results of the questionnaire were tabulated and summarized in the table entitled, "Summary of Questionnaire Results" which appears in the Results section of the study.

The questionnaire was sent along with a letter of transmittal to a random sampling of the faculty. The sampling was selected by checking off every tenth name from the list of faculty in the current college catalog. A total of fifty-two (52) questionnaires were sent out. An addressed franked envelope was supplied for the return of each questionnaire. The responses were completely anonymous and no demographic information was asked for.

Additionally, three corresponding sections from each plan were compared and a judgment was made regarding which one more fully accommodated Theory Y assumptions. Since both plans are clearly stated in terms of who will participate, it was relatively simple to make a judgment regarding which plan provided fuller participation. This part of the study is therefore limited to the judgment of the investigator. The assumption was made that those sections which provided opportunity for the most participation in decision making, were superior since they were more in keeping with the previous research findings and hypotheses cited by this study, in which productivity was increased and the higher level needs of individuals were met.

RESULTS

A tabulation of the questionnaire yielded the following results. The first three questions (see Appendix for Questionnaire), each consisting of two parts, were answered by all thirty-one (31) respondents. Responses indicated that no one had participated directly in the development of the 1976 governance plan, while one (1) was directly involved in the development of the 1973 plan. Two (2) claimed indirect input into the 1976 plan and four (4) had indirect input into the development of the 1973 plan. Twenty-six (26) were familiar with the 1976 plan while five (5) were not. Six (6) were familiar with the 1973 plan while twenty-five (25) were not. Twenty -six (26) percent expressed their opinion regarding which plan they believed to be more feasible, democratic, and flexible. Five (5) expressed opinions in favor of the 1973 plan while three preferred the 1976 plan. Twenty-three (23) respondents expressed no opinion on this. Of the thirty-one (31) respondents, three (3) believed that the 1976 plan permitted them to achieve their maximum potentials on the job, while twenty-eight (28) did not believe so. Regarding this matter, five (5) indicated their preference for the 1973 plan, while the remaining twenty-six (26) had no opinion. Four (4) respondents believed that the 1976 plan permitted adequate opportunity for individual involvement in decision making at the college, while nineteen (19) did not believe so. Regarding this, three (3) believed the 1973 plan offered the opportunity

while the remaining twenty-seven (27) had no opinion. One (1) respondent believed the 1976 plan permitted the individual to be self-directing, while twenty-seven (27) did not believe so. Regarding self-direction, five (5) believed the 1973 plan permitted this, one (1) did not so believe, while twenty-five (25) did not respond. In the area of assuming responsibility through reasonable performance targets, two (2) believed the 1976 plan allowed for this, while twenty-two (22) did not so believe. Regarding the 1973 plan in this area, two (2) responded yes and four (4) responded no, while twenty-five (25) had no opinion. Regarding opportunity for individual standards for productivity and quality, one (1) responded positively to the 1976 plan, with twenty (20) negative responses. In this area five (5) responded positively to the 1973 plan while no one indicated a negative reaction. The final question dealt with voting on the respective plans. Seventeen (17) voted on the 1976 plan; Fourteen (14) indicated that they did not vote. Five (5) voted on the 1973 plan while twenty-six (26) did not.

A tabulated summarization of results follows.

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

QUESTION	YES	%	NO	%	TOTAL %
1.A	0	0	31	1.0	1.00
1.B	1	.03	30	.97	1.00
2.A	2	.06	29	.94	1.00
2.B	4	.13	27	.87	1.00
3.A	26	.84	5	.16	1.00
3.B	6	.19	25	.81	1.00
4.1973 Plan	5	.16			.16
4.1976 Plan	3	.10			.10
5.A	3	.10	28	.90	1.00
5.B	5	.16	0		.16
6.A	4	.13	19	.61	.74
6.B	3	.10	0	0.	.10
7.A	1	.03	27	.87	.90
7.B	5	.16	1	.03	.19
8.A	2	.06	22	.71	.77
8.B	2	.06	4	.13	.19
9.A	1	.03	20	.65	.68
9.B	5	.16	0		.16
10.A	17	.55	14	.45	1.00
10.B	5	.16	26	.84	1.00

N = 31

FIGURE 1

Following is a comparison of three corresponding sections of each governance proposal. The proposals in this study are referred to respectively as the 1973 Plan and the 1976 Plan.

The College Personnel and Budget Committee

The 1973 Plan did not include provisions for a College P and B Committee. It was decided to abolish the College P and B since under the Plan the Personnel Review Committee would supersede its functions.

The 1976 Plan made the following provisions for a College P and B Committee.

College Personnel and Budget Committee

Section 1. Composition

The College Personnel and Budget Committee shall be composed of the President, the Dean of Faculty, the elected department chairpersons, and the elected directors of the Center for African-American Studies and Center for Puerto Rican & Latin American Studies.

A. The President shall serve as chairperson of the Committee; the Dean of Faculty or Dean of the College shall preside as chairperson in the absence of th President.

B. The directors of the Centers for African & African-American Stuides and Puerto Rican & Latin American Studies shall, until otherwise stipulated in B.H. E. By-Laws, have speaking but non-voting privileges.

Section 2. Personnel Functions and Procedures

The College Personnel and Budget Committee shall receive and consider from the departments the appointment, reappointment, reappointment with tenure, and promotion, together with compensation, of all Instructional Staff and recommend action thereon to the President.

A. An individual may appeal an adverse recommendation of the Department P & B or the College P & B to this Committee and avail himself of the grievance procedures of the current collective negotiation agreement.

B. Department chairpersons shall, in presenting candidates from their own departments, vote in accordance with the vote of their own Department P & B Committee. This vote shall be recorded by the College P & B Committee as one (1) positive or negative vote for the candidate; and department chairpersons shall <u>not</u> receive a secret ballot in considering candidates from their own department.

C. The President shall receive the recommendations of the College and Department P & B Committees and shall report his decisions, before public disclosure, to each Committee. If Presidential decisions are not in accord with the combined recommendations of the College and Department P & B Committees, the President shall provide in writing to each Committee the reason(s) for such action.

D. Minutes of the College P & B Committee shall be (within one (1) week following each meeting) placed in the President's Office and College Archives for review by any faculty member.

Section 3. Budget

The College P & B Committee shall share with the President the responsibility for the design and submission of the college budget for approval by the Board of Higher Education.

Since the 1973 Plan abolished the College P & B Committee, a comparison can only be made in terms of why one Plan included such a committee and one did not. The reasons for abolishing the College P & B were stated at the time. The 1973 Plan provides for a Personnel Review Committee to review and insure equitable procedures in personnel decisions. Currently, the Personnel Review Committee consists partially of chairpersons who in some instances vote three times on a candidate, first in the Department P & B, then in the College P & B, and then on the Review Committee. Therefore the Plan abolishes the College P & B since its functions are superseded by the Review Committee.

The 1976 Plan includes provisions for a College P & B Committee, and have been previously outlined. These provisions automatically appoint the President as Chairperson, eliminating participation of the members in an election for a Chairperson. In the event of a negative personnel decision the individual may appeal to the Committee. The appeal must be in writing

and cannot be made in person. Therefore no due process is afforded to the appellant. Due process is provided through the collective negotiation agreement, which is separate and apart from the governance plan.

The College P & B, under the Plan, serves only in an advisory capacity to the President. The President makes the final decision in personnel matters. Under the Plan he must give reasons for negative decisions but is not accountable to anyone for any decision. The Plan provides that the minutes of the meetings must be made available for review by any faculty member. Currently, faculty members do not have access to the minutes which are kept secret. They may be subpoenaed by the courts.

The Plan limits the participation of the directors of the Centers for African and African-American Studies and Puerto Rican & Latin American Studies, in that they are not extended voting privileges.

The Department Personnel and Budget Committees

Following are the provisions made for the Department Personnel and Budget Committees.

1973 Plan

Each department shall have a Committee on Personnel and Budget composed of the department chairperson and four (4) additional members elected by secret ballot by an affirmative, majority vote of those full-time members of the department with at least one (1) semester of full-time service tc the College. A majority of the Committee must have tenure.

No person shall be eligible for service who has not completed at least one (1) full year of full-time service in the College at the time of the election.

All presently constituted Department Committees on Personnel and Budget shall serve the balance of their terms.

At the first election of members held under this Governance Charter, two (2) members shall be chosen for a two (2) year term, and two (2) members shall be chosen for a one (1) year term. All future terms of office shall be for three years.

The Department Committee on Personnel and Budget shall have the department authority in all matters pertaining to appointments, reappointments, promotions, and tenure of faculty as well as matters of budget. All votes of the Committee shall be by secret ballot. Committee minutes shall be made available to any member of the department.

In the event that a decision of any Department P & B Committee is overruled by the President and/or the Personnel Review Committee, no such action shall take place without prior consultation with the Department P & B Committee.

Student evaluation of faculty classroom and teaching performance shall be a factor in all personnel decisions.

1976 Plan

1. Four-fifths (4/5) of the Department P & B Committee must be <u>tenured</u>.

2. Members of the Instructional Staff shall be eligible to vote for and serve as members of the Department P & B

Committee, after having received their first notice of re-appointment or second appointment.

3. Department P & B members shall serve a term of three (3) years.

4. Each department chairperson shall be the chief executive officer of the department and shall represent the department at the College Assembly and the College P & B Committee.

5. Each Departmental P & B Committee shall have the department authority in all matters pertaining to appointments, reappointments, promotions and tenure of faculty, as well as matters of budget. All votes of the Committee shall be by secret ballot.

Student evaluations of faculty classroom and teaching perforamnce shall be a factor in all personnel decisions.

The comparison of the 1973 Plan with the 1976 Plan regarding the sections just presented relative to the Department Personnel and Budget Committees, revealed the degree of participation each provided. Theory Y assumptions are accommodated largely on the basis of participation.

The membership of the Committee must be composed of three (3) tenured faculty members according to the 1973 Plan. The 1976 Plan mandates four (4) tenured members. The 1973 Plan therefore allows for greater participation by faculty members, relative to Committee membership.

Both plans stipulate the same membership eligibility requirements. A faculty member must have served one full year to be eligible.

In order to vote for eligible members of the Department P & B Committee a faculty member must have completed one semester of full-time service at the College under the 1973 Plan. Under the 1976 Plan a faculty member must have completed one year of full-time service in order to vote. The 1973 Plan therefore allows for greater participation by faculty members relative to voting privileges.

Both plans stipulate a membership term of three (3) years.

The 1973 Plan allows faculty members to review the minutes of Committee meetings. The 1976 Plan does not. In this instance the 1973 Plan accommodates Theory Y assumptions, while the 1976 Plan adheres to Theory X assumptions and System 1 management.

Both plans stipulate that student evaluations must be considered in all personnel decisions.

The overall comparison indicates that the 1973 Plan more fully accommodates Theory Y assumptions relative to the Departmental Personnel and Budget Committees.

COMPARISON OF PLANS WITH REGARD
TO DEPARTMENT PERSONNEL AND
BUDGET COMMITTEES

	1973	1976
1. Membership	Majority must have tenure	Four fifths (4/5) must have tenure
2. Eligibility	Second appointment	Second appointment
3. Voting privileges	Must have one semester full-time service	Must have second appointment
4. Term of office	Three years	Three Years
5. Minutes available to faculty?	Yes	No
6. Student evaluations necessary for personnel decisions?	Yes	Yes

Additionally the 1973 Plan provides that any member of the Assembly or of the Personnel Review Committee may following advance formal notice, speak at any department meeting or Department Personnel and Budget Committee meeting.

FIGURE 2

Following are the provisions made for the Personnel Review Committee.

1973 Plan

Section 1.

The Personnel Review Committee shall be responsible for reviewing all personnel actions pertaining to the instructional staff within the College and making its recommendations to the president.

Section 2.

The Committee shall be composed of the following members:

A. An Academic Dean designated by the President shall be Chairperson of the Committee.

B. Eight (8) Instructional Staff members who shall be elected by the Instructional Staff in the same maner as at-large Assembly delegates.

No more than one (1) member of any department may serve on this Committee. In the event that more than one (1) person from any department is elected, the person with the highest number of votes shall serve.

No member of the Instructional Staff shall be eligible to serve who has not completed four (4) years of full time service in the College.

C. Two (2) student Members who shall be elected by plurality vote of all students at the same time as an election for members of the Assembly.

No student shall be eligible to serve who is not on the Dean's list at the time of election.

D. No individual shall be eligible for simultaneous service on this Committee and in the Assembly.

Section 3.

Chairmen of Departments shall present any candidate to the Committee who has not received a unanimous affirmative vote of the Department Committee on Personnel and Budget. Any candidate may petition the Review Committee in writing and, additionally, may choose to appear in person before the Committee following advance written notice.

Section 4.

The term of service on the Committee shall be for two (2) years expiring on June 30th.

Section 5.

The quorum for this Committee shall be two-thirds (2/3).

Section 6.

All votes of this Committee shall be by secret ballot. Committee minutes shall be kept on file in the President's Office for review by any member of the College Community.

Section 7.

Upon the third absence from regularly scheduled meetings within an academic year, a Personnel Review Committee member may be dismissed by a two-thirds (2/3) vote of the members present. Vacancies shall be filled by recounting the ballots.

Section 8.

In the event that the President overrules a decision of the Personnel Review Committee, no such action shall take place

without consultation with this Committee.

Section 9.

Elections for Instructional Staff members of the Personnel Review Committee shall be scheduled between April 1st and 15th.

1976 Plan

Section 1. Purpose

A. It shall be the purpose of the Personnel Review Committee to consider personnel actions for the instructional staff in which there is a conflicting decision between the Department P & B Committee and the College P & B Committee. The Personnel Review Committee shall thus consider and resolve personnel actions in the following cases:

1. If the Department P & B renders a positive decision, but the College P & B renders a negative decision.
2. If the Department P & B renders a negative decision, but the College P & B renders a positive decision

The Personnel Review Committee shall review and resolve the above cases and make its recommendations to the President.

Section 2. Composition

A. The Personnel Review Committee shall be composed of six (6) elected members of the Instructional Staff, in the ranks of Professor, Associate Professor, and Assistant Professor. No member of the Instructional Staff who is performing Administrative Service outside of his department is eligible so serve on this Committee.

B. No one shall be eligible to serve unless he has completed three (3) consecutive full-time academic years of service at the College.

C. No member of the College P & B Committee shall be eligible to serve on the Personnel Review Committee.

D. Only one (1) member from any department may be elected to the Personnel Review Committee.

E. All members of the Instructional Staff shall be eligible to vote for members of the Personnel Review Committee after having received their first notice of annual re-appointment.

F. Personnel Review Committee members shall serve a term of two (2) years. No individual may serve two (2) consecutive terms.

Section 3. Procedures

A. The Personnel Review Committee shall at its first annual meeting elect a Chairperson and Secretary, each of whom will serve for one (1) year.

B. All votes of the committee shall be by secret ballot.

C. Members of the Personnel Review Committee shall not vote or be present in considering persons from their own department.

D. A quorum for the Personnel Review Committee shall consist of one (1) less than the total number of committee members eligible to vote on a given action.

E. Committee minutes shall be kept on file in the President's Office and in the College Archives for review by any faculty member.

F. Minutes of the Personnel Review Committee shall be distributed to committee members.

G. Upon the third absence of a committee member within an academic year, that member's seat shall be declared vacant and the vacancy shall be filled by a special election as stipulated in Article IX.

The comparison of the 1973 Plan with the 1976 Plan regarding the sections just presented relative to the Personnel Review Committee, revealed the degree of participation each provided. As has been noted throughout the study, Theory Y assumptions are accommodated primarily on the degree of participation involved in college governance procedures.

Under the 1973 Plan the purpose of the Review Committee is to consider all personnel actions pertaining to the Instructional Staff and to make its recommendations to the President, who continues to make final decisions regarding personnel. In effect, the President may overrule the Committee by exercising his individual judgment. The plan does stipulate however, that in the event the President overrules a decision of the Committee, no such action will take place without consultation with the Committee. This does not preclude the possibility of a Presidential overruling. The 1976 Plan states that its purpose is to consider personnel actions for the Instructional Staff in which there is a conflicting decision between the Department P & B and the College P & B or vice-versa. Whereas the 1973 Plan considers all personnel actions, the 1976 Plan provides consideration only in specific cases involving the aforementioned conflicts.

Regarding membership, the 1973 Plan provides for an eleven (11) member Committee. The Chairperson must be an Academic Dean designated by the President. Eight (8) Instructional Staff members are to be elected by the faculty. Faculty

members are eligible to serve on the Committee only if they have completed four (4) years of full-time service at the College. Two (2) students are to be elected to the Committee by a plurality vote of all students. Students are eligible to serve on the Committee only if they are on the Dean's List at the time of election. The 1976 Plan provides for a Chairperson to be elected by the Committee of six (6). These six members are to be elected by the faculty. Eligibility for service on the Committee is restricted to the professorial ranks only, with three years of full-time service at the College. The plan does not provide membership for any students.

Who may vote for members of the Committee is not stipulated in the 1973 Plan. The 1976 Plan stipulates one (1) year of full-time service in order to vote for Committee members.

The term of office is two (2) years under both plans, with the 1976 Plan restricting the Chairperson's term to one (1) year.

The 1973 Plan calls for a quorum of two-thirds (2/3) while the 1976 Plan calls for a quorum of five (5) out of the six (6) members.

The appeals procedure provided by the 1973 Plan, requires a written statement by the appellant. If the appellant so chooses he may request a personal appearance before the Committee. The 1976 Plan does not stipulate procedures for an appeal and does not permit the appellant to make a personal

appearance before the Committee. Both plans make Committee minutes available for review by faculty members.

The overall comparison indicates that the 1973 Plan more fully accommodates Theory Y assumptions relative to the Personnel Review Committee.

COMPARISON OF PLANS WITH REGARD

TO THE PERSONNEL REVIEW COMMITTEE

	1973	1976
Purpose	To review all personnel actions pertaining to Instructional Staff.	To review two (2) types of negative decisions only - those that conflict between the College P&B and Dept.P&B.
Membership	Chairperson (Academic Dean designated by President) Eight (8) elected Inst. Staff. Two (2) students, elected by plurality vote of students.	Chairperson - elected by Committee. Six (6) elected staff. No students.
Eligibility	Inst. Staff- four (4) years full-time service; Students- Dean's list at election.	Inst. Staff- three (3) years full-time service. Professorial rank only.
Voting privileges	Not stipulated.	One (1) year full-time service.
Term of office	Two (2) years.	Two (2) years - Chairperson; one (1) year.
Quorum	Two thirds (2/3).	5 members.
Appeals procedure	Petition in writing.	Not stipulated.
Personal appearance of appellant permitted? (due process)	Yes.	No.
Minutes available for review by faculty members?	Yes.	Yes.

FIGURE 3

DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In this study a comparison was made of two college governance plans of the Borough of Manhattan Community College, neither of which has been ratified and instituted. Both plans, referred to throughout the study as the 1973 Plan and the 1976 Plan, incorporate elements of the participatory model of governance. The Board of Higher Education mandated that each college of The City University must review and revise its governance procedures to allow for participation of all members of the college community in decision making on campus.

This investigation set out to determine, through a comparison of both plans, which plan provided more fuller participation of all members of the College community.

The questionnaire utilized in the study indicated that faculty members were not aware of the history of the development of governance procedures at the College. Very few faculty members queried had any direct participation in the development of the 1973 Plan. None of the members who responded to the questionnaire had any direct participation in the development of the 1976 Plan. Some felt that they did have indirect input into the development of the plans. As one can readily ascertain from the results presented, the plans were not developed by significant group process. More faculty members were familiar with the 1976 Plan than they were with the 1973 Plan. This is probably due to the fact that the later plan was just presented and was still fresh in everyone's mind. It is interesting to note that the 1973 Plan

was approved for ratification by the faculty and students but not by the administration. This is significant since the administration must have felt that it was not sufficiently represented, or did not have adequate participation in the plan.

Although the response was low regarding faculty opinions on which plan was considered to be more feasible, democratic and flexible, the 1973 Plan took the lead. Many people simply did not respond to the question, and the assumption here is that they did not know enough about either plan to make any judgment. Throughout the questionnaire responses were low because the faculty simply did not have enough background on the plans. However, among those who did respond to the questions the results indicated that more faculty members believed that the 1973 Plan permitted greater opportunity to achieve maximum potentials on the job, to be self directing, and to establish individual standards for productivity and quality. More faculty members believed that the 1976 Plan provided greater opportunity to be involved in decision making at the College. Fifty-five (55) percent indicated that they voted for the 1976 Plan, while only sixteen (16) of the respondents voted on the 1973 Plan. This may be due in part to the fact that the College has experienced tremendous growth since 1973, and many respondents may not have been around at the time the 1973 Plan was submitted to the faculty and voted upon for ratification. It appears that a great deal of ignorance prevails on the part of the faculty relative to the 1973 Plan.

The questionnaire was designed to provide faculty input and did yield significant results if only to point up the fact that little was known about the development of governance procedures at the College, and even less was known about the plan that was formulated back in 1973.

The comparison itself, with each of the sections placed side by side, indicated that in more instances the 1973 Plan provided greater opportunities for faculty and student participation in the governance procedures of the College, relative to the three specific areas selected for observation.

The 1973 Plan sought to abolish the College Personnel and Budget Committee since the Personnel Review Committee functions would supersede it. The comparison points out that the 1973 Plan provides for due process in every personnel decision by allowing an Instructional Staff member to present his case in person before the Review Committee. Under present conditions no member of the staff has this right of personal appeal. The 1976 Plan does not make this provision. Also the 1976 Plan considers only two types of negative personnel decisions, while the 1973 Plan considers all personnel actions. Looking further into the comparison relative to the Review Committee, the 1976 Plan provides for only six (6) Committee members elected by the faculty. The 1973 Plan permits far greater participation by allowing for administrative input. The Chairperson of the Committee is an Academic Dean appointed by the President. In addition, eight (8) Instructional

Staff members are elected to sit on the Committee, as well as two (2) students, elected by a plurality vote of all students.

Regarding the Department P and B Committees the 1973 Plan calls for a majority of members with tenure. The 1976 Plan stipulates that four (4) of the five (5) members must have tenure. The 1976 Plan is more restrictive here and therefore less participatory in nature. While the 1973 Plan makes an Instructional Staff member with one semester of full-time service eligible to vote for Committee members, the 1976 Plan is more restrictive and calls for one (1) year of full-time service in order to vote. Both plans however, seem to provide for a reasonable residency requirement to insure familiarity with the issues before a person may vote. Under current conditions at the College, no instructor or lecturer may vote even with nine (9) years of service in the College but someone hired at faculty rank may vote from the day he enters the school. In another area the 1973 Plan is more participatory in that it makes avaliable to the staff, minutes minutes of the Department P and B Committee. The 1976 Plan does not make this provision.

Through this comparison it appears that the 1973 Plan allows for more democratic and efficient sharing of leadership and responsibility among more members of the staff to cope with the problems of the College. This does not discredit the 1976 Plan from the standpoint of participation.

The most interesting fact continues to be that the 1973 Plan was approved by students and faculty, but not by the administration. A look at the history of the development of the plans sheds additional light on the total situation.

Since May of 1970, BMCC has been trying to develop a governance plan. A Task Force consisting largely of full professors, chairpersons and Deans was reputedly hand-picked by the then Dean of the College to draft a proposal. Periodically, the Committee's membership was changed by the addition of new, reputedly hand-picked members. The one representative of junior faculty on the Committee was allowed to participate only after forceful repeated requests for some sort of younger faculty representation. Between May, 1970 and May, 1972, the Committee's chairpersonship changed hands three times. Meetings were poorly attended, consensus difficult to arrive at. Faculty response to the Task Force document was negative and was never brought to a faculty vote.

On November 29, 1972, in the third year of an attempt to arrive at a governance proposal, three former members of the Task Force Committee moved at a full faculty meeting that a new governance committee be formed to consist of four faculty, one representative appointed by the Union, one administrative representative, and one student government member. These seven representatives constituted the Governance Committee which drafted the 1973 Plan. The Committee made the following statement relative to its attempts to solicit and encourage

faculty input for the 1973 Plan:

> We have met with every department in the College. We have held a three hour open hearing. We have appeared at a PSC chapter meeting. We have solicited by mail on two occasions written remarks and suggestions. We have held three meetings with the faculty for five hours, two hours, and two hours respectively. We have revised the document two times. This document represents the third and final form of the plan which incorporates faculty suggestions and revisions while still retaining principles of desireable change. This represents unprecedented attempts by a committee in this College to insure that the staff has had ample opportunity to acquaint themselves with the issues and to suggest revisions.

The committee that drafted the 1976 Plan presented it to the faculty with no explanatory statement attached. The committee that prepared the 1976 Plan consisted of eight (8) members. No students were represented, although they will vote on ratification of the plan. Of the eight (8) members, six (6) are on the Instructional Staff, one (1) is the President's Labor Designee, and one (1) is the Registrar. The 1976 Plan was approved by the Faculty Council on March 26, 1976.

To date the voting has not been completed on this plan. Given this history, the future of governance at the College should this proposal be defeated is uncertain. Whether the Board of Higher Education will choose to impose a plan of its own cannot be predicted. It seems clear that the Board will not allow the College to operate indefinitely without a participatory plan.

The implications of this study are clear. the side by side comparison of selected aspects of both plans, plus the faculty input through the questionnaire, indicates that the 1973 Plan is more participatory than the 1976 Plan. It further indicates that both plans move toward the initiation of participatory governance at the College. This in itself is significant to the faculty, students and administration in carrying out the mission of the College. It is therefore recommended that positive changes be instituted toward more participation in the current college governance procedures which are Theory X and Systems 1 and 2 oriented. These recommendations for positive change should be implemented through the mechanisms available to the Faculty Council. From this a governance charter can emerge with the best possible compromises of all concerned. In the meantime, if the 1976 Plan is ratified, it should be pointed out that amendments to the plan can be proposed at any time by 15 percent of the Instructional Staff. Such amendments will enable the College to accommodate more and more the Theory Y assumptions, and a movement toward a System 4 approach as advocated by Richardson (9:108).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Argyris, Chris, Personality and Organization. New York: Harper, 1957.

2. Drucker, Peter, The Practice of Management. New York: Harper, 1950.

3. Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., Snyderman, B., The Motivation to Work. New York: Wiley, 1959.

4. Herzberg, F., "One More Time: How Do You Motivate Employees?", Harvard Business Review, January-February, 1968, pp. 53-57.

5. Lesieur, Frederick G. (Ed), The Scanlon Plan. New York: Wiley, 1958.

6. Likert, Rensis, The Human Organization: Its Management and Value. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

7. Maslow, Abraham, Motivation and Personality. New York: Harper, 1970.

8. McGregor, Douglas, The Human Side of Enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

9. Richardson, R.C., et. al., Governance for The Two Year College. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice, 1972.

APPENDIX

BOROUGH OF MANHATTAN COMMUNITY COLLEGE
THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK
1633 BROADWAY, NEW YORK, N.Y. 10019

June, 1976

Dear Colleague:

The attached questionnaire concerned with a governance charter for BMCC is part of a practicum which I am writing in connection with course requirements at Nova University.

Various committees at the College have developed plans over the years to provide a charter that is feasible, democratic, and flexible. This questionnaire asks for your opinions. It has been tested with a small sampling from members of the Department of Developmental Skills and has been revised so that it will require only a few moments of your time.

The questionnaire compares the 1976 BMCC governance charter plan with the plan submitted in 1973, with respect to how closely each plan meets the Board of Higher Education mandate that each unit in CUNY revise its governance procedures to "allow for participation of all members of the college community in decision making on their campus."

A summary of the questionnaire results will be sent to you at your request. Each questionnaire, you will note, is anonymous. Your cooperation is appreciated.

Sincerely,

James Schiavone

James Schiavone
Assistant Professor
Developmental Skills

enc.

QUESTIONNAIRE

Two governance charter plans are referred to in this questionnaire. One is recent and is dated May, 1976. An earlier plan dated April, 1973, was not ratified. Both plans have been made available to the faculty.

1. A. Did you participate directly in the development of the 1976 governance plan?

Yes_____

No_____

B. The 1973 plan?

Yes_____

No_____

2. A. Did you have any indirect input into the 1976 plan?

Yes_____

No_____

B. The 1973 plan?

Yes_____

No_____

3. A. Are You familiar with the 1976 plan?

Yes_____

No_____

B. The 1973 plan?

Yes_____

No_____

4. In your opinion, which plan is the more feasible, democratic, and flexible?

1973 plan_____

1976 plan_____

5. A. Do you believe that the 1976 plan permits you to achieve your maximum potentials on the job?

Yes_____

No_____

B. The 1973 plan?

Yes_____

No_____

6. A. Does the 1976 plan permit you adequate opportunity as an individual to be involved in decision making at the college?

Yes_____

No_____

B. The 1973 plan?

Yes_____

No_____

7. A. Does the 1976 plan permit you to be self directing?

Yes_____

No_____

B. The 1973 plan?

Yes_____

No _____

8. A. Does the 1976 plan permit you to assume responsibility for evaluation through reasonable performance targets?

Yes_____

No_____

B. The 1973 plan?

Yes_____

No_____

9. A. Does the 1976 plan permit you to establish your own standards for productivity and quality?

Yes_____

No_____

B. The 1973 plan?

Yes_____

No_____

10. A. Did you cast your vote on the 1976 plan?

Yes_____

No_____

B. The 1973 plan?

Yes_____

No_____

COMMENTS

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

DEC 23 1976

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES